

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

U S WEST, Inc.  
Suite 700  
1020 Nineteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
202 429-3134  
FAX 202 296-5157

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**USWEST**

Elridge A. Stafford  
Executive Director-  
Federal Regulatory

RECEIVED

JAN 16 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 16, 1998

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222, SC-1170  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Customer Proprietary Network Information, CC Docket No. 96-115  
and  
Non-Accounting Safeguards, CC Docket No. 96-149


Dear Ms. Roman Salas:

Today a representative of U S WEST met today with Kevin Martin of Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth's office to discuss the above-referenced proceedings. U S WEST was represented by the undersigned. The points that were discussed at this meeting are covered in the ex parte filed in these proceedings on June 6, 1997, by SBC Corporation, as a coalition position on behalf of U S WEST and other carriers.

In accordance with Section 1.1206(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules, the original and four copies of this letter, are being filed with your office for inclusion in the public record for the above-mentioned proceedings. Acknowledgment of date of receipt of this transmittal is requested. A duplicate of this letter is provided for this purpose.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



cc: Kevin Martin

No. of Copies rec'd 0+3  
List A B C D E



# ***Number Portability Cost Recovery***

**U S WEST**  
***January 16, 1998***  
Elridge Stafford

## **Overview**

- **All Costs Identified for Recovery Relate Solely to Number Portability**
- **Cost Recovery Rules Must Recognize Difference in Markets**
- **End User Surcharges Are The Best Recovery Plan**
- **Number Portability Is A Federal Mandate**

## **All Costs Identified for Recovery by USWC Relate Solely and Directly to Number Portability**

- Certain network upgrades are included in USWC costs for Number Portability.
- Contrary to the Commission's position, these network upgrades should be treated as type 2 carrier-specific costs directly related to providing number portability, rather than type 3 carrier-specific costs not directly related to number portability.

## **Cost Recovery Rules Must Recognize Difference in Markets**

- Revenues from the incremental deployment of Number Portability related software are speculative at best in many markets.
- USWC deploys software for enhanced services only where a market need has been identified.
  - Areas where Number Portability causes new software to be deployed have not been identified as potential markets.
  - Small population & lack of business customers desiring AIN services.
  - Cost of incremental investments is too high to justify offering service.
  - USWC has deployed CLASS features in all switches.
- The great majority of services enabled by new generics and software merely provide monitoring capabilities.
  - SS7 SSP capability has virtually no potential for new revenues.
  - All new AIN capability is for Number Portability only.
  - All vendors have licensed AIN capability for providing Number Portability only.
  - Any additional uses require a separate license agreement & payment.

## **Cost Recovery Rules Must Recognize Difference in Markets (Cont'd.)**

- Buckley, WA (Seattle MSA) -- Selected for Number Portability
  - DMS 10 switch
  - Switch serves approximately 2900 access lines.
  
- Aberdeen, SD -- Expected future deployment
  - 1990 population -- 24,927 -- small by national standards, but Aberdeen is the third largest city in South Dakota -- big by South Dakota standards.
  - When competition comes to South Dakota, it will come to Aberdeen. For example, the access service consortium of South Dakota independent telephone companies.
  - Aberdeen switch serves approximately 19,000 access lines.

## **End User Surcharges Are the Best Recovery Plan**

- The '96 Act and the Commission have determined that deployment of Number Portability is an important first step in developing local competition in telecommunications.
  - "To the extent that customers are reluctant to change service providers due to absence of Number Portability, demand for services by new service providers will be depressed.... and thereby frustrate the competitive goals of the 1996 Act." (First R&O @ paragraph 31)
  - Deployment primarily benefits new entrants, not incumbents.
  - Recovery of costs over a short period is essential for competitive neutrality.
- All current customers benefit from Number Portability and should pay the cost.
  - Virtually all calls (intrastate and interstate) within or to Number Portability areas will require use of Number Portability investments.
  - They can change service providers in the future without changing their telephone number.
  - They can call others who have changed service providers without learning new telephone numbers.

## **End User Surcharges Are the Best Recovery Plan (Cont'd.)**

- Surcharge should be applied to all end users bills.
- An end user surcharge plan over a relatively short transition period is the best recovery plan and is competitively neutral.
  - Any surcharge over a three-to-five year period will be small. Most likely substantially less than customers pay in telephone taxes.
  - Simplest and least costly alternative.



## **Number Portability is a Federal Mandate**

- U S WEST believes that all Number Portability costs should be recovered through a Federally mandated surcharge.
- In the alternative the Commission should not place unnecessary limitations on state cost recovery methods.